27

28

LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC.; S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON; MARK

DEAN M. LUVISA.

H. RACHESKY; AMIN I. KHALIFA and

Defendants.

		O ₃
1	Pursuant to California Rule of Cou	rt 3.300(d), Leap Wireless International, Inc. is
2	required to file and serve its state court Notice of Related Cases, attached hereto as Exhibit A, in	
3	this related action.	
4	Dated: June 19, 2008	espectfully submitted,
5	N	ATHAM & WATKINS LLP Miles N. Ruthberg
6	P K	amela S. Palmer Limberly Arouh Hicks
7 8		ake Ryan Curtis Carll Daniel K. Greene
9		and II. Greene
10	В	y <u>/s/ Kimberly Arouh Hicks</u> Kimberly Arouh Hicks Attorneys for Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.
11		Attorneys for Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17	,	
18		
19		
20)	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

PROOF OF SERVICE

3

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is Latham & Watkins LLP, 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800, San Diego, CA 92101-3375.

4

On June 19, 2008, I served the following document described as:

5

DEFENDANT LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF RELATED CASES FILED IN STATE COURT

6

by serving a true copy of the above-described document in the following manner:

7

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

8 9

I am familiar with the United States District Court, Southern District of California's practice for collecting and processing electronic filings. Under that practice, documents are electronically filed with the court. The court's CM/ECF system will generate a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the filing party, the assigned judge, and any registered users in the case. The NEF will constitute service of the document. Registration as a CM/ECF user constitutes consent to electronic service through the court's transmission facilities. Under said

11

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

practice, the following CM/ECF users were served: Lionel Z. Glancy Attorneys for Plaintiff HCL Partners

email: info@glancylaw.com Lori Sambol Brody, Esq. KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 1801 Century Park East, Suite 1460 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (310) 785-0893 / Fax: (310) 785-0897 email: lbrody@kaplanfox.com

GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP

1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 311

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Kirk Hulett, Esq.

Telephone: (310) 201-9150 Facsimile: (310) 201-9160

Blake M. Harper HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP 550 West C Street, Suite 1600 San Diego, CA 92101

Tel: (619) 338-1133 / Fax: (619) 338-1139 email: kbh@hulettharper.com

email: bmh@hulettharper.com

Nicole Lavallee BERMAN DeVALERIO PEASE TABACCO **BURT PUCILLO** 425 California Street **Suite 2100**

San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 433-3200/Fax: (415) 433-6382 email: nlavallee@bermanesq.com

Limited Partnership and Lead Plaintiff New Jersey Carpenter Pension Benefits Fund

Attorneys for Plaintiff Kent Carmichael

Attorneys for Movant Westchester Capital Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment Management L.L.C.

Attorneys for Movant Louisiana Municipal Police Employees Retirement System

SAN DIEGO

27

EXHIBIT A

SAN DIEGO

Notice of Related Cases

Pursuant to California Rules of Court 3.300 (c), Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc. ("Leap") hereby gives notice to the Court and all interested parties that the above captioned state derivative case is related to: (1) pending federal derivative and securities cases, and (2) dismissed cases.

A. Related Pending Federal Derivative And Securities Cases

This case, Lori McBride, Derivatively on Behalf of Leap Wireless International, Inc. v. S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, James D. Dondero, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta, and Michael B. Targoff, and Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc., filed February 7, 2008 (hereinafter the "Leap State Derivative Litigation"), is related to the following pending federal cases:

- 1. The federal derivative case pending in the United States District Court of the Southern District of California, before the Honorable Barry T. Moskowitz: Charles Graham, Derivatively on Behalf of Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc. v. S. Douglas Hutcheson, Amin Khalifa, Grant Burton, Dean M. Luvisa, Michael B. Targoff, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta, Mark H. Rachesky, M.D., and James D. Dondero and Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc., Case No. 08cv0246 BTM (NLS), filed February 7, 2008 (hereinafter the "Leap Federal Derivative Litigation").
- 2. The consolidated securities class action case pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, before the Honorable Barry T. Moskowitz: HCL Partners Limited Partnership v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., S. Douglas Hutcheson, Dean M. Luvisa, Amin I. Khalifa, and PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP, Lead Case No. 07cv2245 BTM (NLS), filed November 27, 2007, and Kent Carmichael v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, Amin I. Khalifa and Dean M. Luvisa, Case No. 08cv128 (hereinafter collectively the "Leap Securities Litigation").

SAN DIEGO

B. Related Dismissed Cases

The Leap State Derivative Litigation is also related to the following three dismissed cases—one state derivative action and two federal securities class actions (collectively the "Dismissed Cases"):

- 1. Charles Graham, Derivatively on Behalf of Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc. v. S. Douglas Hutcheson, et al., Superior Court of California for the County of San Diego Case No. 37-2008-00075341-CU-MC-CTL, filed on January 9, 2008 and subsequently dismissed. Derivative plaintiff Graham refiled his action in this Court on February 7, 2008 and it is the Leap Derivative Litigation.
- 2. Frank Charek v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., et al., United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 07CV2256DMS(CAB), filed November 28, 2007 and subsequently dismissed.
- 3. Devay Campbell v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., et al., United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 07CV2297BTM(NLS), filed December 7, 2007 and subsequently dismissed.

C. Description Of The Manner In Which The Cases Are Related

Pursuant to California Rules of Court 3.300 (a), an action or proceeding is related to another action or proceeding where both of them: (1) involve the same parties and are based on the same or similar claims; (2) arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact; (3) involve claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property; or (4) are likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.

1. The Leap State Derivative Litigation is related to the Leap Federal Derivative Litigation.

The state and federal derivative litigation meet each of the factors identified above for related cases. First, they both involve substantially overlapping parties—Leap and several of

its current and former officers and directors, including S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, James D. Dondero, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta, and Michael Targoff. Second, they both arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events – Leap's financial restatements for the period 2004 to 2007 that was announced in November 2007, and allegations of the defendants' knowledge regarding the accounting errors and alleged deficiencies in internal controls in the four years prior to such announcement. Further, both the state and federal cases will require the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact, including but not limited to the threshold issue of shareholder standing to bring the claims derivatively. Third, both the state and federal derivative action involve the same claims, including but not limited to breach of fiduciary duty claims. Fourth, both the state and federal derivative action will require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.

Due to the overlapping nature of the *Leap State Derivative Litigation* and the *Leap Federal Derivative Litigation*, Leap will move to stay this state action until the parallel federal action is resolved.

2. The Leap State Derivative Litigation is also related to the Leap Securities Litigation

The Leap State Derivative Litigation and the Leap Securities Litigation also meet each of the factors identified above for related cases. First, they both involve substantially overlapping parties—Leap and several of its current and former officers and directors. Second, they both arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events—including a restatement of Leap's financial statements for the period 2004 to 2007, as announced on November 9, 2007, and the individual defendants' alleged knowledge of the accounting errors underlying such restatements and alleged lack of internal controls. Further, the Leap State Derivative Litigation and the Leap Securities Litigation Leap will require the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact, including legal issues pertaining to the scope of discovery and factual issues such as whether the alleged errors violate GAAP, when

1	the defendants became aware of the alleged errors, and whether the defendants traded on		
2	material adverse information. Third, both the Leap State Derivative Litigation and the Leap		
3	Securities Litigation are likely to require substantial duplication of judicial resources and risk		
4	inconsistent rulings if heard by different judges on a variety of issues, including discovery issues,		
5	factual issues, and issues pertaining to the extent of the automatic discovery stay under the		
6	Private Securities Litigation Reform Act when, as here, a motion to dismiss a securities claim is		
7	pending. The Southern District of California has already determined that the Leap Federal		
8	Derivative Litigation is related to the Leap Securities Litigation, and for the same reasons, this		
9	Court should similarly find the Leap State Derivative Litigation is related to the Leap Securities		
10	Litigation.		
11	3. The <i>Leap State Derivative Litigation</i> is also related to the Dismissed		
12	Cases		
13	For the reasons discussed above, the Leap State Derivative Litigation is also		
14	related to the dismissed state derivative action and the dismissed federal securities actions.		
15			
16	Dated: June		
17	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Miles N. Ruthberg		
18	Pamela S. Palmer Kimberly Arouh Hicks		
19	Curtis Carll Daniel K. Greene		
20			
21	By Kimberly Aroun Hicks		
22	Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.		
23	Boup Wholoss International, Inc.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	4		

1 2 3 4 5	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Miles N. Ruthberg (Bar No. 086742) miles.ruthberg@lw.com Pamela S. Palmer (Bar No. 107590) pamela.palmer@lw.com 355 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: +1.213.485.1234 Facsimile: +1.213.891.8763		
6 7 8 9	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Kimberly Arouh Hicks (Bar No. 163285) kimberly.hicks@lw.com Curtis Carll (Bar No. 248470) curtis.carll@lw.com Daniel K. Greene (Bar No. 253595) daniel.greene@lw.com 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 San Diego, California 92101-3375		
11	Telephone: +1.619.236.1234 Facsimile: +1.619.696.7419		
12	Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.		
13	,		
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
15	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO		
16			
16 17	LORI MCBRIDE, Derivatively on Behalf of Leap Wireless International, Inc.,		07-00081584-CU-MC-CTL
1	Leap Wireless International, Inc.,	PROOF OF SER	VICE OF NOMINAL
17		PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF
17 18	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff,	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES
17 18 19	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H.	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF
17 18 19 20	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA,	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer 61
17 18 19 20 21	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF,	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer 61
17 18 19 20 21 22	Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer 61
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and -	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer 61
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer 61
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California corporation,	PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATIONA RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer 61

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is Latham & Watkins LLP, 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800, San Diego, California 92101-3375.

On June 19, 2008, I served the following documents described as:

NOMINAL DEFENDANT LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF RELATED CASE

by serving a true copy of the above-described document in the following manner:

	By Federal Express. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for
	collecting and processing packages for delivery by FedEx, which practice is that when packages are
	deposited with the Latham & Watkins personnel responsible for depositing packages with FedEx,
u	such packages are picked up by a representative of FedEx that same day in the ordinary course of
	business.
	By E-Service. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for preparing and
	serving documents by e-mail, which practice is that when documents are to be served by e-mail,
	they are scanned in a .pdf format and sent to the addressees on that same day in the ordinary course
· ·	of business.
	By Facsimile. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting,
	processing, and transmitting facsimiles. Under that practice, when a facsimile is deposited with the
Ш	Latham & Watkins personnel responsible for facsimiles, such facsimile is transmitted that same day
	in the ordinary course of business.
	By U.S. Mail. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting and
	processing documents for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Under that practice,
×	documents are deposited with the Latham & Watkins personnel responsible for depositing with the
	United States Postal Service; such documents are delivered to the United States Postal Service on
	that same day in the ordinary course of business, with postage thereon fully prepaid in a sealed
	envelope.
	By Hand Delivery. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for
_	collecting and processing documents for hand delivery by a messenger service or a registered
Ш	process server. Under that practice, documents are given to the messenger service or registered
	process server for the delivery of documents by hand in accordance with the instructions provided to
	the messenger service or registered process server; such documents are delivered to the messenger
	service or registered process server on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I caused a
	sealed envelope or package containing the above-described document(s) and addressed as set forth
	below in accordance with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting and processing
	documents for hand delivery by a messenger service or a registered process server.
	By Electronic Filing. I am readily familiar with the United States District Court, Southern District
(C)	of California's practice for collecting and processing electronic filings. Under that practice,
×	documents are electronically filed with the court. The court's CM/ECF system will generate a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the filing party, the assigned judge, and any registered users in
	the case. The NEF will constitute service of the document. Registration as a CM/ECF user
	constitutes consent to electronic service through the court's transmission facilities. Under said
	practice, the following CM/ECF users were served:
	The state of the s

The documents were served on the following parties in the above captioned action and the pending related cases:

3

1

2

4	Leap State Derivative Litigation	
5	Jeff S. Westerman, Esq. Elizabeth P. Lin, Esq.	Attorneys for Plaintiff Lori McBride
6	MILBERG LLP 300 South Grand Ave., Suite 3900	
7	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: 213-617-1200	
8	Fax: 213-617-1975	
9	email: <u>jwesterman@milberg.com</u> email: <u>elin@milberg.com</u>	
10	(Via U.S. Mail)	
11	Anita Kartalopoulos, Esq.	
12	Kent A. Bronson, Esq. MILBERG LLP	
13	One Pennsylvania Plaza New York, NY 10119	
14	Tel: 212-594-5300 Fax: 212-868-1229	
15	email: akartalopoulos@milbergweiss.com	
16	email: kbronson@milbergweiss.com (Via U.S. Mail)	
17	Bruce G. Murphy, Esq.	
18	LAW OFFICES OF BRUCE G. MURPHY 265 Llwyds Lane	
19	Vero Beach, FL 32963	
20	Tel: 772-231-4202 Fax: 772-231-7222	
21	email: bgm@brucemurphy.biz	
22	(Via U.S. Mail)	
23		

23

24

25

26

27

Keith E. Eggleton, Esq. Diane M. Walters, Esq. WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI APC 650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304 Tel: 650-493-9300 Fax: 650-493-6811 email: keggleton@wsgr.com email: dwalters@wsgr.com (Via U.S. Mail)	Attorneys for Individual Defendants S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, James D. Dondero, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta and Michael B. Targoff
Leap Securities	Litigation
Lionel Z. Glancy GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 311 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 201-9150 Facsimile: (310) 201-9160 email: info@glancylaw.com (Via Electronic Filing)	Attorneys for Plaintiff HCL Partners Limited Partnership and Lead Plaintiff New Jersey Carpenter Pension Benefits Fund
Lori Sambol Brody, Esq. KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP	Attorneys for Plaintiff Kent
1801 Century Park East, Suite 1460	Carmichael
Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (310) 785-0893 / Fax: (310) 785-0897	
email: _lbrody@kaplanfox.com (Via Electronic Filing)	
Kirk Hulett, Esq.	Attorneys for Movant Westchester
Blake M. Harper HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP 550 West C Street, Suite 1600	Capital Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment Management L.L.C.
San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 338-1133 / Fax: (619) 338-1139	
email: kbh@hulettharper.com	
email: bmh@hulettharper.com (Via Electronic Filing)	
Nicole Lavallee	Attorneys for Movant Louisiana
BERMAN DeVALERIO PEASE TABACCO BURT PUCILLO	Municipal Police Employees Retirement System
425 California Street Suite 2100	Remement System
San Francisco, CA 94104	
Tel: (415) 433-3200/Fax: (415) 433-6382 email: <u>nlavallee@bermanesq.com</u> (Via Electronic Filing)	

1	Christopher Lometti, Esq.	Attorneys for Movant Jersey
2	Jay P. Saltzman, Esq.	Carpenters Pension and Benefits Fund
2	Ashley Kim, Esq. Daniel B. Rehns, Esq.	
3	SCHOENGOLD SPORN LAITMAN &	
	LOMETTI	
4	19 Fulton Street, Suite 406	
e	New York, New York 10038	
5	Tel: 212-964-0046 email: chris@spornlaw.com	
6	email: jay@spornlaw.com	
	(Via Electronic Filing)	
7		
8	Ramzi Abadou	Attorney for Movant Alaska Electrical
O	COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN AND	Pension Fund and Genesee County
9	ROBBINS	Employees' Retirement System
10	655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101	
10	(619)231-1058	
11	email: ramzia@csgrr.com	
	(Via Electronic Filing)	
12	Leap Federal Derivative Litigation	
13	Edward M. Gergosian, Esq.	Attorneys for Plaintiff Charles Graham
	GERGOSIAN & GRALEWSKI LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1410	Granam
14	San Diego, CA 92101	
15	E-mail: ed@gergosian.com	
13	(Via Electronic Filing)	
16	Voith E. Eggloton, Egg	Attorneys for Individual Defendants
17	Keith E. Eggleton, Esq. Diane M. Walters, Esq.	A TOTAL OF THE
17	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI	
18	APC	
10	650 Page Mill Road	
19	Palo Alto, CA 94304	
20	Tel: 650-493-9300	
2.1	Fax: 650-493-6811	
21	email: keggleton@wsgr.com	
22	email: dwalters@wsgr.com	
	(Via Electronic Filing)	
23	Livillales seves the shave referenced to	anneant to be filed in the country of
24	cases.	ocument to be filed in the pending related
24	I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of, or permitted	
25	to practice before, this Court at whose direction the ser	vice was made and declare under penalty
26	of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.	
20	Executed on June 19, 2008, at San Dieg	go, California.
27		
28	Andrea Rasco	
ں ہے		
	4	

LATHAM & WATKINS W SD\636315.1
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN DIEGO